DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 680 SO 009 455

AUTHOR Blackburn, Guy J.
TITLE Human Relations Training and Teachers' Attitudes. Prepublication Draft.
PUB DATE 7 Jun 76
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Atlanta, Georgia, November 19-23, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Racial Attitudes; *Sensitivity Training; Social Attitudes; *Statistical Analysis; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Minnesota

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of Minnesota's mandatory human relations training program on the attitudes of teachers. An anonymous and complex questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of Minnesota's educators. Social and racial attitudes of teachers who had been trained under the mandatory program were compared with those of untrained teachers. Attitudes toward contemporary classroom practices were also measured. Analysis of variance was used to determine the effects of sex, teaching level, and years of teaching experience on teachers' attitudes. Measures were taken to examine three areas of attitudes: (1) identifying and dealing with discrimination, (2) creating positive learning environments, and (3) respecting human diversity. These instruments were designed to measure the major components of Minnesota's Human Relations Program. The results revealed that the training seemed to have had no effect on teachers' attitudes in the latter two areas. Human relations training did, however, seem to help teachers "identify and deal with discrimination." Female teachers scored higher on all three measures than males. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129680

Prepublication Draft
Do Not Duplicate
June 7, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Guy Blackburn
Oakland Schools
2100 Pontiac Lake Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48054

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of Minnesota's mandatory human relations training program on the attitudes of teachers. An anonymous and complex questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of Minnesota's educators. Social and racial attitudes of teachers who had been trained under the mandatory program were compared with those of untrained teachers. Attitudes toward contemporary classroom practices were also measured. The effects of the factors of sex, teaching level, and years of teaching experience on teachers attitudes were examined through analysis of variance. Measures were taken to examine three areas of attitudes. They were: 1) Identifying and Dealing with Discrimination, 2) Creating Positive Learning Environments, and 3) Respecting Human Diversity. These instruments were designed to measure the major components of Minnesota's Human Relations Program. The results revealed that the training seemed to have had no effect on teachers' attitudes in the latter two areas. Human relations training did however, seem to help teachers "identify and deal with discrimination." Female teachers scored higher on all three measures. Several significant interactions also occurred revealing the complexity of the impact of the training.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Guy Blackburn
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Guy J. Blackburn
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP009455

Introduction

The social upheavals of the late 1960's and early 170's focused much attention on the social and racial attitudes of teachers. Ethnic leaders, community spokesmen, and many educators around the country began to examine the role of teacher attitudes as they related to implicit racism and sexism in education (5, 13, 19, 20). At the same time a groundswell for "humanistic education" emerged. Many persons concerned about the prevailing social atmosphere of schools and classrooms were convinced that the only way to effect change within the institution of education was to systematically train teachers to have more positive social attitudes and to deal with children in a more humanistic fashion (4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 20).

Such undertakings were ambitious to say the least. In most instances state and local efforts floundered because of political and financial realities. The state of Minnesota, however, successfully launched a statewide mandated program of human relations training that was to affect more than forty thousand teachers. This study examined the effects of that program on teachers' attitudes (2, 15, 16).

Background

On February 16, 1971, the Minnesota State Board of Education adopted a regulation requiring all teachers seeking certification or recertification to participate in a state approved human relations program. The overall aim of the regulation was summarized in a State Department document as being to "...develop in people in education, leadership and knowledge so as to provide a more humane educational environment. Inherent in the rationale is the assumption of pluralism--the idea that societal differences are the norm rather than the exception" (15).

The Minnesota Human Relations Regulation, titled Edu 521, was an extraordinary approach to teacher certification requirements and teacher education in general (6).

Minnesota was the first and remained the only state at the time of this study to implement a statewide mandatory program of human relations training for both preservice and inservice teachers. Wisconsin has recently adopted a requirement for human relations training in preservice teacher education. California requires school districts to provide human relations programs for teachers who are employed in schools where the student population is made up of twenty-five percent or more minority children. In California, however, participation in the program is voluntary.

Minnesota's human relations regulation requires teachers to participate in state approved human relations programs consisting of sixty hours of instruction (6).

The regulation further specifies the human relations "competencies" in which teachers will be trained. The regulation requires that programs train teachers to:

(a) Understand the contributions and life styles of the various racial, cultural, and economic groups in our society, and

(b) Recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases, discrimination, and prejudices, and

(c) Create learning environments which contribute to the self-esteem of all persons and to positive interpersonal relations, and,

(d) Respect human diversity and personal rights.

This investigation studied the effects of the latter three components of this regulation (6). The first component was deleted after analysis of the regulation and the human relations program developed under it revealed that all the major elements of component (a) were provided for in components (b) and (d).

This study was designed to answer two fundamental questions:

1. Are teachers' attitudes positively affected by human relations training?

2. Do factors such as sex, level of teaching, and years of teaching affect teachers' attitudes?

Because of the complexity of the requirements of human relations training in Minnesota and the post facto nature of this study, twenty-seven null hypotheses were tested to answer the above questions (2, 15).

Procedure

In order to examine the effects of training on all teachers throughout the geographic regions of the state a mail survey approach was adopted (17, 18).

Population Sample

In May of 1974, at the time of this study, approximately 53,000 educators were certified in the State of Minnesota. Nearly 30,000 educators had completed the training. A 3% random sample of all Minnesota's educators was drawn (N = 1583). An anonymous questionnaire was mailed under the auspices of the Human Relations Office of the Minnesota State Department of Education. A 62.7% return was attained. The sample included educators other than teachers, however, only results from teachers were analyzed (2).

For the purpose of this study, teachers in Minnesota were categorized as follows:

1. Those who had completed training under the regulation,
2. Those who had not completed the training but were required to do so in the future, and
3. Teachers holding life certificates who were not required to participate in human relations.

The life certificated teachers were eliminated in a preliminary phase of analysis. Simple analysis of variance and Scheffés S method were used to conduct this phase of analysis (2, 7, 10). As predicted, it was found that these teachers scored lower than either the trained or untrained teachers on all three attitude measures. On the measures

for classroom environment and social and racial attitudes the differences were significant. The measure for "identifying and dealing with discrimination" yielded significance only on the comparison with the trained teachers and the life certificated teachers. This phase of analysis provided evidence that differences, not due to training existed between life certificated teachers and other teachers in the sample. Thus, life certificated teachers were eliminated from the major phase of analysis.

Research Design

A complex factorial design was used to analyze the results from the questionnaire. The question of central interest was whether those teachers trained in human relations held more positive attitudes than untrained teachers. Thus, trained teachers formed a group that was analogous to an experiment group while untrained teachers were viewed as a control group. The status of training was assigned to the B factor in the factorial design, with trained teachers being represented by (b_1) and untrained by (b_2) (See Tables I and Ia). In order to look more closely at the effects of the training, three other factors were examined. They were: A) sex, C) levels of teaching (elementary and secondary), and D) years of teaching experience (1-2 years, 3-6 years, 7-10 years, 11 or more years). Thus, results from the questionnaire were analyzed in a set of three 2 X 2 X 2 X 4 factorial designs. It was necessary to analyze the results in three separate tests in order to measure the results of training conducted under the three components of the human relations program being examined. Alpha was set at .05 for all tests (7, 10).

The Questionnaire

In order to collect meaningful data to be used in examination of the effects of the Minnesota's Human Relations Program, relevant and valid information had to be elicited by the instrument used in the study. To establish content areas for item

TABLE I

Analysis of Variance for Four Factor Design
for Component (b) (Identifying and dealing with discrimination)

Source	Sums of Squar.	DF	Mean Square	F
A (Sex)	262.52662	1	262.52662	6.39787*
B (Comparison Groups)	207.12818	1	207.12818	5.04779*
C (Teaching Level)	130.56717	1	130.56717	3.18197
D (Years of Teaching)	405.88155	3	135.29385	3.29716*
AB	226.76863	1	226.76863	5.52643*
AC	45.60857	1	45.60857	1.11150
AD	56.84831	3	18.94944	0.46180
BC	191.73217	1	191.73217	4.67258*
BD	93.05869	3	31.01956	0.75596
CD	110.10903	3	36.70301	0.89447
ABC	25.51084	1	25.51084	0.62171
ABD	220.87327	3	73.62442	1.79425
ACD	45.12313	3	15.04104	0.36656
BCD	138.02986	3	46.00995	1.12128
ABCD	164.01974	3	54.67325	1.33241
ERROR	26753.81362	652	41.03345	

* F .05 (1,400) = 3.86
* F .05 (3,400) = 2.62 (Edwards, 1968) (7)

** F .01 (1,400) = 6.70
** F .01 (3,400) = 3.83

TABLE Ia

Means for Component (b)
(Identifying and dealing with discrimination)

A: Sex

	(a_1) Females	(a_2) Males
Mean	31.43	30.47
Standard deviation	6.53	6.50
N	413	271

B: Comparison Groups

	(b_1) Completed	(b_2) Not completed
Mean	31.36	30.41
Standard deviation	6.63	6.27
N	463	221

C: Teaching Level

	(c_1) Ele. (K-6)	(c_2) Sec. (9-12)
Mean	30.82	31.26
Standard deviation	5.88	7.07
N	328	356

D: Years of Teaching

	(d_1) 1-2 years	(d_2) 3-6 years	(d_3) 7-10 years	(d_4) 11 + years
Mean	30.34	32.29	31.64	29.58
Standard deviation	5.05	6.73	6.92	6.23
N	82	239	143	220

development of the questionnaire the investigator inquired into the facets of the State's programs. This was done through interviews, reviews of relevant Minnesota State Department of Education documents, and attendance at a conference where coordinators of various programs reported the types of activities performed in their respective programs. This portion of the investigation took the form of field research (2).

The Edu 521 regulation provided the general guidelines for the content areas of the questionnaire. The categories on the State's application for program approval also provided insight into content and processes of the State's program. The ten criteria for program approval were provided by the Human Relations Office of the State Department of Education. These were also used as guides for instrument development (2).

Expository and research literature on the effects of human relations training in other settings were helpful in providing background, but in most instances did not provide assistance in constructing items suitable to measure the specific content of the State's program (3, 4, 8, 22, 24). Exceptions were the works of Edwards (7), Shaw and Wright (21), Oppenheim (17), and Besel (1) which provided theory, items, and format for parts of the instruments.

Attitude scales were constructed to assess attitudes relating to several content areas of the State's program. Likert-type items were used with response categories: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. No neutral position was provided because of the difficulty in interpreting such responses. Scales and items were developed that related to all three of the components of the Edu 521 Regulation that were under investigation. Consideration of content and activities from programs in the field were also used in construction of this part of the questionnaire. Scales and items were developed to measure attitudes in the following areas: a) Native Americans,

b) Black Americans, c) sex-role equality, d) elderly persons, e) homosexuals, f) divergent life styles, g) new school concepts, h) personal flexibility, i) integration, j) handicapped persons, k) economically deprived persons, l) identifying discrimination, m) ethnic/cultural diversity, n) positive sounding stereotypes, o) rights vs. property, and p) affirmative action (See Figure 1 for sample items from several attitude scales).

Check lists were constructed to examine teaching behavior through written responses of the subjects. These check lists attempt to elicit information relative to teaching environments and teacher attitudes in this area. These check lists dealt with student/teacher interaction, seating arrangements, personalization of instruction, student freedom in the classroom, and "values" lessons. Other check lists were constructed to examine behavior in the areas of personalized instruction, teaching and personal flexibility (17).

Another check list was an adaptation of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (3) presented by Shaw and Wright (21). Items were also taken directly from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, Citizenship--National Results Report 2, to measure racial attitudes.

The final section of the questionnaire was written to examine the effects of the (b) component of the Minnesota Human Relations Regulation which requires participants to "recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases, discrimination, and prejudices..." In this section the respondents were asked, in 16 items of identical format, to identify instances of discrimination they had witnessed and indicate what action they took. There were four social groups that were provided as potential victims of discrimination. They were members of: a) a racial or ethnic group, b) male or female, c) religious minority, and d) deprived economic class. The items also presented four classes of

Items from the instrument for Human Relations Component (b)

Curriculum materials are free of biases against racial and ethnic groups.

Racial discrimination is not a major problem in schools in this country.

Items from the instrument for Component (c)

Open concept classrooms are an unnecessary fad which will soon pass from existence.

We are too easy on kids in schools these days.

Items from the instrument for Component (d)

Most Indians spend a lot of time and money drinking.

Integration of schools is beneficial to both white and black children alike.

Figure 1

Items selected from various attitude scales within the questionnaire. All items are Likert-type with response categories of: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

potential perpetrators of discrimination in the school setting. They were administrators, teachers, students, and non-certified staff members. Again, the effort here was to elicit responses indicating behavior rather than attitude (See Figure 2 for an example of these items).

Validity

For the purpose of establishing the validity of the instrument to the content of the human relations program, the following procedures were used. Scales, items, and check lists described above were presented to the Human Relations Evaluation Task Force on April 23, 1974. The nine members of the Task Force (four of whom were professors of education) represented human relations programs at six institutions of higher learning in the State and State Department of Education. The members of the Task Force were asked to serve as judges for the validity of the instrument.

The members were asked to perform several functions. First, they were to approve or disapprove each item and check list as being valid or invalid to measure some aspect of the human relations program as they had experienced it; second, they were asked to label each item and check list with an appropriate mark to indicate which of the (b) through (d) components of the regulation the item was intended to measure. Proper response categories were provided for these functions. These activities were conducted in the form of secret balloting. Third, the judges were asked to write any suggestions for additional categories to be included. An open discussion was then held and notes were taken on comments made. As a result of the session, several items were withdrawn. Additional items were prepared for attitudes toward different lifestyles, rights of homosexuals, and handicapped persons.

a. In your school, in the past year or so, have you observed one or more cases of discrimination (unfair treatment) against a member of a racial or ethnic group by a student or group of students?

_____ Yes (If yes, please answer part b)
_____ No (If no, please go to the next question)

b. In the most dramatic instance, which one of the following would best describe your response?

_____ I spoke with the person(s) involved at a later time about discriminating behavior.
_____ I took no action because it was not appropriate for me to do so.
_____ I took immediate action to prevent discrimination by speaking with the person(s) involved.
_____ The incident was not an example of reoccurring discrimination, so I did not feel it was necessary to follow it up.
_____ Other actions I took: (please describe) _____

a. In your school, in the past year or so, have you observed one or more cases of discrimination (unfair treatment) against a member of a deprived economic class by an administrator?

_____ Yes (If yes, please answer part b)
_____ No (If no, please go to the next question)

b. In the most dramatic instance, which one of the following would best describe your response?

_____ I spoke with the person(s) involved at a later time about discriminating behavior.
_____ I took no action because it was not appropriate for me to do so.
_____ I took immediate action to prevent discrimination by speaking with the person(s) involved.
_____ The incident was not an example of reoccurring discrimination, so I did not feel it was necessary to follow it up.
_____ Other actions I took: (please describe) _____

a. In your school, in the past year or so, have you observed one or more cases of discrimination (unfair treatment) against a member of a religious minority by a non-certified staff member?

_____ Yes (If yes, please answer part b)
_____ No (If no, please go to the next question)

b. In the most dramatic instance, which one of the following would best describe your response?

_____ I spoke with the person(s) involved at a later time about discriminating behavior.
_____ I took no action because it was not appropriate for me to do so.
_____ I took immediate action to prevent discrimination by speaking with the person(s) involved.
_____ The incident was not an example of reoccurring discrimination, so I did not feel it was necessary to follow it up.
_____ Other actions I took: (please describe) _____

Figure 2

Selected examples of items from the instrument measuring human relations Component (b) "Identifying and Dealing with Discrimination"

Reliability

An a posteriori reliability study was conducted using the data from the total 289 respondents. Only 100 of the first 107 Likert-type items were involved in the study. A split-halves correlational procedure was used. The other parts of the questionnaire were not included in this split-halves procedure. The format of the other parts made the inclusion of them in this procedure unfeasible.

The reliability coefficient for the 100 Likert items was .94. The Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula was used to obtain this coefficient (2).

Summary of Findings

Scores from the attitude questionnaire were collapsed into three composite scores. Each of the composite scores represented the outcome of one of the components of the human relations regulation. For convenience, the following brief titles were ascribed to the tests on the composite scores: 1) Component b (Identifying and Dealing with Discrimination), 2) Component c (Creating Positive Learning Environments), and 3) Component d (Respecting Human Diversity). Analysis of Variance tables and tables of means are presented for the results on each component (See Tables I, II, and III).

Identifying and Dealing with Discrimination (b)

A composite score was derived by combining attitude scale scores, and exercises in the questionnaire to examine the extent to which teachers could identify instances of discrimination. Analysis revealed that trained teachers did indeed score significantly higher on this component. This suggests that as a result of human relations training teachers were more able to identify instances of discrimination as presented in this questionnaire.

Five other significant results also occurred on this measure. Female subjects scored higher than males. Experienced teachers in middle ranges of years of teaching

experience scored higher than new teachers with one or two years of experience and teachers with eleven or more years of experience.

Two significant interactions also occurred. Sex and training interacted revealing that human relations training appears to have positively affected male teachers while female teachers seem to have been little affected. The second interaction suggests that training positively affected both elementary and secondary teachers but that elementary teachers were affected to a greater extent (See Tables I and Ia).

Creating Positive Learning Environments (c)

Attitude scale scores and results of preferential check lists from the questionnaire were collapsed to obtain a composite score for the second component of Minnesota's human relations regulation. No significance was found when trained teachers were compared with untrained teachers. This suggests that training had no effect in the area of classroom environment as measured by the questionnaire. The only factor that yielded significance on this component was sex. Female subjects again scored higher than males. This provided evidence that female teachers in this sample hold more positive attitudes and that the event is independent of treatment effects (See Tables II and IIa).

Respecting Human Diversity (d)

Scores on a large number of attitude scales and check lists were collapsed to obtain a composite score to measure teachers' attitudes toward racial and social groups. The results of this test again revealed that trained teachers failed to differ significantly from untrained teachers. This finding suggests that Minnesota's human

TABLE II

Analysis of Variance for Four Factor Design
for Component (c) (Creating positive learning environments)

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A (Sex)	979.86093	1	979.86093	5.33619*
B (Comparison Groups)	398.24554	1	398.24554	2.16879
C (Teaching Level)	652.50910	1	652.50910	3.55348
D (Years of Teaching)	764.47356	3	254.82452	1.38774
AB	533.95802	1	533.95802	2.90787
AC	25.77864	1	25.77864	0.14039
AD	1132.77557	3	377.59186	2.05632
BC	503.01727	1	503.01727	2.73937
BD	328.80605	3	109.60202	0.59688
CD	1352.01507	3	450.67169	2.45430
ABC	79.24971	1	79.24971	0.43156
ABD	522.70009	3	174.23336	0.94885
ACD	255.54573	3	85.18191	0.46389
BCD	284.37793	3	94.79264	0.51623
ABCD	505.54075	3	168.51358	0.91770
ERROR	119723.78095	652	183.62538	

* F .05 (1,400) = 3.86
* F .05 (3,400) = 2.62 (Edwards, 1968) (7)

** F .01 (1,400) = 6.70
** F .01 (3,400) = 3.83

TABLE IIa

Means for Component (c)
(Creating positive learning environments)

A: Sex

	(a_1) Females	(a_2) Males
Mean	110.57	105.18
Standard deviation	13.83	13.63
N	413	271

B: Comparison Groups

	(b_1) Completed	(b_2) Not Completed
Mean	108.72	107.84
Standard deviation	13.95	14.08
N	463	221

C: Teaching Level

	(c_1) Ele. (K-6)	(c_2) Sec. (7-12)
Mean	111.77	105.36
Standard deviation	12.68	14.45
N	328	356

D: Years of Teaching

	(d_1) 1-2 years	(d_2) 3-6 years	(d_3) 7-10 years	(d_4) 11 + years
Mean	104.60	109.50	108.40	108.74
Standard deviation	11.68	13.04	15.51	14.52
N	82	239	143	220

relations training failed to change teachers' attitudes as measured in this study. Female teachers scored higher on this measure also. This suggests that of those teachers responding to the questionnaire, female teachers held more positive attitudes than males. This result may have been related to a bias in the attitude scales favoring women.

A third main effect difference was found to be significant on the measure for "respecting human diversity." Teachers in the middle ranges of years of teaching experience again scored higher than less experienced teachers as well as the teachers who have been teaching eleven years or more.

Ten significant interactions occurred in the test for "respecting human diversity." Several were very complex; one is of special interest. Male and female teachers seem to have been affected differently by the training. Although no overall differences were found between trained and untrained teachers, training seemed to have positively affected male teachers while negatively affecting female teachers (See Tables III and IIIa).

Discussion

The results of this study warrant several major observations. First, two of the areas studied yielded results to indicate that human relations did not affect teacher attitudes in two important areas. This suggests that this extensive program may be ineffective in helping teachers form more positive attitudes toward: a) creating humane learning environments and b) respecting human diversity.

Most noteworthy of the two non-significant findings was the measure for "respecting human diversity." A great deal of emphasis is placed on changing teachers' social and racial attitudes in a positive direction in the Minnesota program. This being the case it is reasonable to suggest that careful analysis of these aspects of

TABLE III

Analysis of Variance for Four Factor Design
for Component (d) (Respecting human diversity)

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A (Sex)	10318.73287	1	10318.73287	23.48589**
B (Comparison Groups)	871.87457	1	871.87457	1.98442
C (Teaching Level)	1628.10339	1	1628.10339	3.70563
D (Years of Teaching)	10108.34544	3	3369.44848	7.66901**
AB	8898.64126	1	8898.64126	20.25369**
AC	436.48502	1	436.48502	0.99346
AD	3519.22541	3	1173.07514	2.66997*
BC	6991.44560	1	6991.44560	15.91284**
BD	6074.22929	3	2024.74310	4.60840**
CD	9869.25380	3	3289.75127	7.48762**
ABC	3631.20671	1	3631.20671	8.26478**
ABD	4182.72116	3	1394.24039	3.17335*
ACD	4007.39840	3	1335.79947	3.04034*
BCD	4913.41405	3	1637.80468	3.72771*
ABCD	4006.27379	3	1335.42460	3.03948*
ERROR	286462.17491	652	439.35889	

* F .05 (1,400) = 3.86
* F .05 (3,400) = 2.62 (Edwards, 1968) (7)

** F .01 (1,400) = 6.70
** F .01 (3,400) = 3.83

TABLE IIIa

Means for Component (d)
(Respecting human diversity)

A: Sex

	(a_1) Females	(a_2) Males
Mean	186.64	180.23
Standard deviation	22.66	20.50
N	413	271

B: Comparison Groups

	(b_1) Completed	(b_2) Not Completed
Mean	183.92	184.48
Standard deviation	22.16	21.82
N	463	221

C: Teaching Level

	(c_1) Ele. (K-6)	(c_2) Sec. (7-12)
Mean	184.77	183.48
Standard deviation	20.76	23.16
N	328	356

D: Years of Teaching

	(d_1) 1-2 years	(d_2) 3-6 years	(d_3) 7-10 years	(d_4) 11 + years
Mean	179.71	189.44	183.76	180.16
Standard deviation	22.58	20.85	24.48	20.16
N	82	239	143	220

Minnesota's human relations program be conducted. Revisions of content and methods may be in order. These findings also provide a basis for caution for those institutions that are moving toward implementation of human relations training programs. Program design and methodology should be developed with knowledge of the Minnesota experience in mind.

A positive outcome of human relations training was revealed in the results on the measure in which teachers were asked to identify instances of discrimination against various social groups by school personnel. It appears that in this area, where teachers' responses were more closely related to observable overt acts, that human relations training did indeed have an affect. This suggests that although verbal attitudes may not have been affected by training, that the ability to identify and recall instances of discrimination was affected. This further suggests that as a result of human relations training, teachers in the schools of Minnesota are more aware of discrimination. An analysis of the aspects of Minnesota's Human Relations Training Program that caused this positive outcome is in order. This knowledge would enable educational planners in Minnesota to strengthen their program. Such analysis and resulting information would also be of great value to educational leaders elsewhere who are considering implementation of human relations programs.

A third very important finding in the study was that human relations training seemed to affect groups of teachers differently. This was especially apparent for male and female groups. Elementary and secondary teachers also seemed to have responded differently to aspects of the human relations training. These occurrences suggests a diagnostic approach might be preferable to a blanket mandate for training.

The fourth finding of importance was that female teachers scored higher on all measures in this study and these responses seem to be largely independent of the

effects of human relations training. One possible explanation for these results is that two of the instruments were biased in favor of females. Women were asked to respond to items dealing with sex-role stereotyping and equality of opportunity. However, a post facto examination of the responses to some items that might be considered to have a sex bias indicated that females did not differ greatly from males. Female teachers also scored higher on the instrument for measuring attitudes towards "creating positive learning environments" that seemed to be free of sex biases. Further study should be made in this area to see if female teachers do indeed hold more positive attitudes in these areas. If this is indeed the case human relations programs should be developed with this in mind.

Some Cautions in Interpreting the Results

Caution should be taken in interpreting the results of this study for the following reasons: The study was ex post factor in nature and the data are correlational. Casual statements should be interpreted with this in mind. The training in the Minnesota program was conducted over an extended period of time and under diverse circumstances. Thus, treatment of the training as a unitary phenomenon is awkward. Selection although random in sampling was affected by the voluntarism by those who returned questionnaires. The return rate was high by the standards of comparable survey research but the study contains no evidence of how non-responders might have answered to the questionnaire. A final problem existed in the complex composite scores in which numbers of scale sub-scores were collapsed. Sensitivity to attitude differences is specific areas was lost (2).

Summary

This study was the first major effort to examine the outcomes of Minnesota's large and complex human relations training program. The lives of most of the teachers in the state are affected by this mandatory program. Potentially the lives of all the youngsters in Minnesota's schools may be effected. Resources of individual teachers

and state monies have been used to finance the program. This study was an effort to provide information to help educational leaders in Minnesota make decisions regarding human relations training in the future. It also provides new information for educatonal planners elsewbere who are undertaking the development of human relations programs.

REFERENCES

1. Besel, Ronald R., "The Construct Validation of an Opinion Survey Instrument," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1970.

2. Blackburn, Guy, "An Examination of the Effects of Human Relations Training on the Attitudes of Certificated Inservice Teachers of Minnesota," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1974.

3. Bogardus, E.S., "Social Distance and Its Origin," Journal of Applied Sociology, Vol. 9, 216-226, 1925.

4. Borton, Terry, "Reform Without Politics in Louisville," Saturday Review, Vol. 55, No. 6, 51-55, 1972.

5. Colman, James S., et al, Equality of Educational Opportunity. Report of survey submitted to President and Congress under Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966.

6. Edu 521 Human Relations Regulation, Teacher Certification Section, State of Minnesota, Department of Education, St. Paul 55101, Code F30-33, Feb. 16, 1971.

7. Edwards, Allen L., Experimental Design in Psychological Research, (3rd Ed.) New York: Holt, 1968.

8. Heinrich, Laura J., "Human Relations Training and Education: An Analysis of Reports of Current Practices in Public Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972.

9. Jones, Richard M., Fantasy and Feeling in Education, New York: Harper, 1970.

10. Kirk, Roger E., Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1968.

11. Leonard, George B., Education and Ecstasy, New York: Delta, 1968.

12. Likert, Rensis, "The Method of Constructing An Attitude Scale," in Martin Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement, New York: John Wiley, 1967.

13. Long, Barbara E., "Mental Health in the Classroom: A Climate for Learning," Today's Education, Vol. 61, No. 6, 50-52, 1972.

14. Menninger, W. Walter, "What Every Schoolman Should Know About Prejudice," The American School Board Journal, Vol. 159, June, 26-28, 1972.

15. Minnesota State Department of Education, An Evaluation Design for Human Relations Programs in Teacher Education in the State of Minnesota; 1973-1974. A draft. Evaluation Section, Division of Planning and Development. Prepared by John Comstock, 1974.

16. Minnesota State Department of Education, Human Relations and Teacher Education. Position paper, Task Force for Human Relations in Teacher Education, September 14, 1970.

17. Oppenheim, Abraham N., Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York: Basic Books, 1966.

18. Parten, Mildred, Surveys, Polls and Samples: Practical Procedures, New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1966.

19. Pettigrew, Thomas, Racial Isolation in Public Schools, Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

20. Rosenzweig, Patricia P., "Why Your District Needs a Human Reltions Program," The American School Board Journal, Vol. 59, No. 7, 34-36, 1972.

21. Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M., Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

22. Stein, Annie, "Strategies for Failure," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 41, No. 2, 158-204, 1971.

23. Sussna, Frances, et al, "Special Feature on Human Relations in the Classroom," Today Education, Vol. 62, No. 1, 30-43 and 60-61, 1973.

24. Zimbardo, Philip and Ebbensen, Ebbe, B., Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.